REMARKS

Claims 22-31 are currently pending. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight et al. (U.S. Pub. App. 2003/0163587) in view of Funkhouser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,807,469). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 22, neither Knight nor Funkhouser teaches or suggests "multiple vehicle processors... each adapted to generate diagnostic information indicating success of software installation on the respective vehicle processor." In addition, neither Knight nor Funkhouser teaches or suggests "an interface processor... adapted to... identify software files stored on the portable memory device for each of the multiple vehicle processors, load the identified software files onto the multiple vehicle processors, and transmit diagnostic information received from the multiple vehicle processors to the portable memory device."

As best understood by Applicant, Knight discloses an adapter 200 connected to multiple control computers. However, the multiple control computers do not generate diagnostic information indicating success of software installation," as claim 22 recites.

Further, the adapter 200 does not identify software files stored on the portable memory device for each of the multiple vehicle processors, load the identified software files onto the multiple vehicle processors, or transmit diagnostic information received from the multiple vehicle processors to the portable memory device, where the

diagnostic information indicates software installation success, as claim 22 recites. Instead, as best understood by Applicant, the adapter 200 is only adapted to load new software for itself. This software is simply loaded into an EEPROM 222 of the adapter 200, not into multiple processors. See paragraphs [0123]-[0124] of Knight.

While Funkhouser discloses "retrieving diagnostic data from the vehicle," (col. 3, line 30), there is no teaching or suggestion of multiple vehicle processors, each adapted to generate diagnostic information, as claim 22 recites. More specifically, Funkhouser is silent as to whether the diagnostic information indicates success of software installation on the respective vehicle processor, as claim 22 recites. The Examiner does not point to, and Applicant has not identified, any teaching or suggestion in Funkhouser of an interface processor that identifies software files, loads the identified software files, or transmits diagnostic information, where the diagnostic information indicates software installation success, as claim 22 recites.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record. Claim 27 is in condition for allowance for at least similar reasons as claim 22. Claims 23-26 and 28-31 ultimately depend from claims 22 and 27 and are therefore also in condition for allowance for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 2, 2008

By: _____

Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/MRN/mea